

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

As requested to address the Examiner's objections, in the attached set of drawings Figures 1, 2, 3A and 3B of p. 1 have been labeled as "Prior Art" and reference character 50 has been deleted from Figure 1. No amendments have been made to the other Figures in this application.

**REMARKS****Election/Restriction**

Applicant affirms the election of Group 1, claims 1-2 and 4-10.

Withdrawn independent claims 11 and 18 have been amended to include the limitations of claim 1.

**Claim Objection**

Claim 8 has been amended as requested to overcome the claim objection.

**§ 102 Rejections**

Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Tsuruoka (JP 2000-094329).

The amendments to claim 8 are believed to obviate the rejection under 35 USC § 102(b).

**§ 103 Rejections**

Claims 1-2 and 4 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuruoka in view of Fister (US4632898).

Claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Tsuruoka in view of Fister as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Carre (US5853446).

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tsuruoka as applied to claim 8 above and further in view of Fister.

The examiner states that Tsuruoka (JP 2000-094329) does not teach that the fine structure pattern is comprised of a glass or ceramic material.

The Applicant would like to bring to the Examiner's attention p. 8, paragraph 0014 that recites as follows:

In the barrier wall die material that has a structure formed from a single material, for example, soda glass, aluminum, brass, ceramics can be used as materials. As the easily polished material layer of the barrier wall die material 2c that has a laminated layer structure, for example, it is possible to use acrylic resin, graphite material. Also, as the difficult to polish material layer, for example, it is possible to use copper, soda glass as materials.

Accordingly, Tsuruoka (JP 2000-094329) teaches a barrier wall die material formed from a single material such as soda glass. Tsuruoka (JP 2000-094329) also teaches a barrier wall die material that has a laminated layer structure having an “easily polished layer” of acrylic resin or a graphite material and as the “difficult to polish material layer” copper or soda glass.

Hence, Tsuruoka (JP 2000-094329) fails to teach or suggest a (e.g. laminated) master mold “comprising a support layer comprised of a material and a fine structure pattern comprised of a glass or ceramic material supported by said support layer; wherein the support layer material has a lower grinding speed than the material of the fine structure pattern.”

The Applicant submits that Fister describes, “a process for making clear glass tooling from a polished, flat glass plate.” (See column 1, lines 64-66 of Fister (US4632898).

“The method entails the steps of coating a polished surface of a glass blank with a continuous metal coating. A photoresist is applied, exposed, and developed in a desired pattern. Uncovered metal is etched away and the remaining metal provides a mask. The uncovered glass is plasma etched to feature the surface of the glass blank.” (See col. 1, lines 38-45)

According to column 2, lines 43-45, “After the chrome has been removed, the master is optically clear and can transmit ultraviolet light.”

Hence, although *an intermediate* in the formation of the glass tooling comprises a thin layer of metal (preferably chrome) on a polished flat glass plate, the glass tooling thus formed comprises solely of glass since the chrome is removed during the fabrication process.

Accordingly, Fister also does not describe a master mold “comprising a support layer comprised of a material and a fine structure pattern comprised of a glass or ceramic material supported by said support layer; wherein the support layer material has a lower grinding speed than the material of the fine structure pattern.”

Since neither Tsuruoka (JP 2000-094329), nor Fister (US4632898) teach a master mold in accordance with Applicant’s claims, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been established by the Examiner.

Reconsideration and a timely allowance as respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

January 9, 2009

Date

By: /Carolyn A. Fischer/

Carolyn A. Fischer, Reg. No.: 39,091

Telephone No.: 651-575-3915

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel  
3M Innovative Properties Company  
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833